



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/911,971	07/23/2001	Lynn George Miller	4336 P	5151

7590 11/27/2002

Lloyd W. Sadler
MCCARTHY & SADLER, LC
Suite 100
39 Exchange Place
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

EXAMINER

OLSON, LARS A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3617

DATE MAILED: 11/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/911,971

Applicant(s)

MILLER, LYNN GEORGE

Examiner

Lars A Olson

Art Unit

3617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 November 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 3617

DETAILED ACTION

1. An amendment was received from the applicant on November 8, 2002.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carlisle (US 5,664,975).

Carlisle discloses a boat propeller safety enclosure, as shown in Figures 3-6, that is comprised of a cloth cover or bag, defined as Part #12, with a first side having a shape and a second side having an adjustable opening, as shown in Figure 6, and a cinch region on said second side of said cover or bag, defined as Part #22, that is further comprised of a loop of fabric, defined as Part #24, an opening for access to the interior of said loop of fabric, as shown in Figure 6, a tying device or drawstring, defined as Part #40, that is located generally within said loop of fabric and having a first end and a second end extending out of said opening, as shown in Figure 6, and a releasable lock device, defined as Part #50, that is fitted to said first end and said second end of

Art Unit: 3617

said tying device, as shown in Figure 6. Said cover or bag is provided with reflective tape, defined as Part #60, that is a fluorescent orange in color, as stated in lines 26-27 of column 4, as well as a second opening for drainage, defined as Part #30 in Figure 8, as stated in lines 50-52 of column 4. Said cover or bag is also sized and shaped to adopt the general shape of a propeller when it is installed and cinched tightly about said propeller, as shown in Figures 3 and 4.

Carlisle, as set forth above, does not disclose the use of an insert panel within said cover to define the shape of said first side, an insert panel made from either plastic or metal, and a cover made from a mesh or plastic material.

It is known in the art to utilize an insert panel within a cover or bag to define the shape for a side of said cover or bag. It is also known in the art to make said insert panel from either plastic or metal. It is also known in the art to utilize a cover or bag that is made from a mesh material, as well as bags that are formed from tubular plastic mesh.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to utilize a plastic insert panel or a bag formed from a plastic mesh material in combination with the boat propeller safety enclosure as taught by Carlisle for the purpose of providing a propeller cover that is better supported to hold a desired shape, and is made from a lighter and stronger material that is easily drained of water.

Art Unit: 3617

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on November 8, 2002 regarding claims 1-10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that the prior art cited does not disclose the use of a boat propeller safety enclosure that is comprised of a cover having an opening that is adjustable in size, and a second opening for drainage. The applicant also argues that the prior art does not disclose the use of said enclosure having a size and shape that adopts the general shape of a propeller when installed and cinched tightly about a propeller.

In response to the applicant's first argument, Carlisle (US 5,664,975), as indicated above, discloses a propeller safety cover with a first opening that is adjustable in size, and a second opening for drainage.

In response to the applicant's second argument, Carlisle also discloses a propeller safety cover with a size and shape that adopts the general shape of a propeller when installed and cinched tightly about a propeller. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the rejection of claims 1-10 is deemed proper.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 3617

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Exr. Lars Olson whose telephone number is (703) 308-9807.

lo

November 25, 2002


S. JOSEPH MORANO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600